



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/160,312	09/25/1998	YUSHI JINNO	5586D-6921	6189

26021 7590 10/23/2002

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.
500 S. GRAND AVENUE
SUITE 1900
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071-2611

EXAMINER

PARKER, KENNETH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2871

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/160,312	JINNO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kenneth A Parker	2871	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2871

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claims 1-4 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Taniguchi JP 03-290623.

Claim 1 has no driving circuits listed, peripheral has multilayer from TFT, and claim 15 has the peripheral protection line being multilayer. The reference shows a shoring bar in the

Art Unit: 2871

peripheral portion of the display made from d1 and g1 (see figure 1a), the drain and gate metalizations. The shorting bar is, of course, a shielding wire (static protection). Therefore, these claims are anticipated by Taniguchi.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiraki et al, U.S. Patent # 5,671,026 in view of Kouchi et al, US Patent 5,886,385.

Art Unit: 2871

The primary reference discloses:

- A liquid crystal with a pair of substrates and liquid crystal between them, polarizing plates around the cell, TFT driving and switching circuits with the same structure, and with protective circuits which have an overlap of the same metalizations as both of the drive and switching circuits. Therefore, these claims are anticipated by Shiraki et al.

The primary reference lacks: the indication that the terminals have a portion having a lamination structure similar to the TFTs.

The secondary references all show multilayer external circuits using the films used in the TFTs. The terminals required a multilayer structure for passivation, strength and conductivity, and so multiple layers were used. The references teach reasons of protection and moisture resistance. The TFT layers were used because they were there, and therefore there was no reason to add additional unnecessary layers, and for the reduction of patterning steps.

Therefore, it would have been obvious, in the devices and or methodologies taught by the primary reference, to employ the modification disclosed by the secondary reference for the benefit stated.

Still lacking from the disclosure is the explicit indication that the terminals are 8mm or more away from the driving circuits. Yamazaki shows the region with the driving portion a considerable distance away from the terminals (see cover figure). Even if this were not taken as an indication to form the terminals .8mm or more from the driving circuits, it was well known to employ sealants around the driving circuits, and therefore it would have been necessary to form

Art Unit: 2871

the driving circuits a sufficient width away from the terminals to enable interposing elements which are required, such as sealants or other crossing lines. Further, the shorting rings are on the other side of a cut, and the terminals, so considerable room was needed for all of those elements.

4. Claim 1-2 and 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi JP 03-290623.

Still lacking from the disclosure is the explicit indication that the terminals are 8.mm or more away from the driving circuits. Yamazaki shows the region with the driving portion a considerable distance away from the terminals (see cover figure). Even if this were not taken as an indication to form the terminals .8mm or more from the driving circuits, it was well known to employ sealants around the driving circuits, and therefore it would have been necessary to form the driving circuits a sufficient width away from the terminals to enable interposing elements which are required, such as sealants or other crossing lines. Further, the shorting rings are on the other side of a cut, and the terminals, so considerable room was needed for all of those elements.

5. Claim 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Kouchi et al US005886365A in view of Shiraki et al US005926234A .

Claim 3 has driving circuits listed and peripheral protection line which is not necessarily multi-layer. Kouchi et al has multilayer wires in the peripheral portion of the display, but lacks the shorting or grounding line. The use of shorting or grounding lines was conventional, and

Art Unit: 2871

would have been obvious for that reason. This is evidenced by Shiraki et al, which states such (col. 12, lines 56-64).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive (claim 6) and/or moot in view of the new grounds of rejection (other claims). Claim 6 has no "protection" claimed, the old rejection is therefore applicable.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Several documents Matsunaga and Taniguchi JP '024 are cited which employ multiple layer shielding wires employing the metalizations from the transistors.

Applicant is invited to call the examiner to discuss the claims and any potentially allowable subject matter.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2871

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth Parker whose telephone number is (703) 305-6202. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-7722. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or preceding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

October 20, 2002



**KENNETH ALLEN PARKER
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
GAU 2871**